



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the history of foreign countries, there is an equally dangerous result. Knowing their affairs only, or chiefly from books, the understanding is not baffled by the complexity and contradictoriness of the phenomena. Such history can be turned into a doctrine, reduced to general theorems, with a rapidity and undoubtingness which fails us when we attempt our own. It is here, and because of this, that Mr. Adams has failed. His book reads like a tract for the times. As a latter-day pamphlet it is to be welcomed, but as an essay on history it is to be rigorously criticized. Whatever value the work possesses is independent of the argument put forward in the preface, but is to be found in the method of grouping historical phenomena; a method which in the future will be of immense value to the historian equipped for its application. That method is the method of economic history.

JOHN L. STEWART.

Philadelphia.

Fallacies of Race Theories as Applied to Race Characteristics.

Essays by WILLIAM DALTON BABBINGTON, M. A. Pp. 289. Price, \$2.00. London and New York. Longmans, Green & Co., 1895.

The essays published in this book were collected by a friend of the author after his death, and printed, as containing matter worth preserving. The general thesis of the book may be taken to be that there are no such things as national or race characteristics; no peculiar qualities which are to be explained by the hereditary character of the stock, but that all differences in the political and other institutions of different races may be attributed to other and more probable causes. Heredity is of little importance, environment of supreme importance.

The author calls attention to the simplicity with which writers of different nations speak of certain excellent qualities as if they were characteristic *par excellence* of the races to which they themselves belonged; and of the opposite qualities, as if they belonged primarily to other races, and were to be found in specimens of their own only by way of exception. Thus, the English writer is apt to point out what a kindly person the Englishman is, how brave and wise, how true, how prudent and pious. The opinions of other nations may be summed up, on the contrary, in the expression "perfidious Albion." Germans, in the same way, have formed for themselves the main conception of the German whose qualities they are wont to emphasize by speaking of *German* daring, *German* patience, *German* diligence, etc. It is easy to see how these national types come into existence, but not easy to establish any sure foundation for them. The author

points out that if we take immutability as a test there is no truth in the ancestral theory of national character. Popular modes of thought and feeling may change utterly and completely, and frequently do so with great rapidity and are probably not more in one nation than in another.

The first essay in the book is devoted to a review of the history of the Roman Empire in its relation to race theories. The current notion that the Roman race was thoroughly degenerate and had lost its vitality, while the barbarian races possessed not only vitality but a high type of the qualities which are necessary for civilization, is vigorously combatted by the author. And he undertakes to show that other causes having little or no relation to the vitality or decaying of the stock are sufficient to account for the fall of the Empire. The second essay is given to the character of the Gauls before and after the Roman invasion, showing how completely the Gauls had changed their supposed national character within a comparatively short period. Another essay is given to the examination of the supposed virtues of the early Germans, in which the author tries to show that they had the ordinary traits of all barbarians.

Still another chapter is given to Momson's characterization of the Celtic and German races. It ends with the suggestion that a famous passage from Momson's History might be read as follows: "In the accounts of the ancients as to the Teutons of the Elbe and the Main, we find almost every one of the characteristic traits we are accustomed to recognize as marking the Irish. Every feature reappears." "In fact," he says, "an examination of Momson's parallels between the ancient Gauls and the modern Irish shows pretty clearly that a closer parallel might be drawn between the Irish and the Teuton." This need afford, however, no surprise to any one who, in Gibbon's words, "condescends to reflect that similar manners will be produced by similar situations." The author takes up an equally extreme case in the contrast of the Saxon in England and the Celt, and maintains that "it is not possible to formulate any set of qualities as characteristic of one or the other." "Differences of personal condition are sufficiently accounted for by long-continued difference of environment. Local position, convenience or remoteness, climate and soil, social influences, legislation and administration of the law, political history and religion, or its absence—these are true and sufficient causes and there is no reason for imagining any other."

The author does not hesitate to take a still more extreme case and maintains that the progress of China was arrested not by its racial characteristics, but by its philosophy; and maintains that, if we had adopted the same method of handing over government to the control

of an intellectual aristocracy, western Europe would be as unprogressive as we imagine China to be.

Much might be said in the way of criticism of the positions which the author defends. But the circumstances under which the essays were published rather preclude severe criticism, and on the whole we are inclined to agree with the editor, that the matter was worth publishing. It may be said, however, apropos of the point raised in regard to China, that even if we agree that it was philosophy and not racial peculiarities which arrested Chinese development, we have still to explain the fact that the Chinese were willing to accept a system of government by philosophers, while the Aryans would not. Nor would it be an easy thing, we fancy, to demonstrate that racial peculiarities had no place in fixing the relative position of the black and red races toward the white race in the history of civilization; unless, indeed, we should maintain that living in Africa would make the white race black, or living in America make it red, with all which that implies.

EDMUND J. JAMES.

University of Chicago.

Geschichte der Nationalökonomischen Krisentheorieen. By EUGEN VON BERGMANN. Pp. viii, 440. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer. 1895.

Professor Cossa has conveniently subdivided the general history of economic theory into an "external" history, dealing with economic systems as wholes, and an "internal" history, tracing the development of particular economic doctrines. The first method is largely biographical; the second is essentially doctrinal. The relative utility of the two methods need not be determined. They are obviously complementary rather than competitive. It is impossible to adopt a cross-sectional treatment until the broad strata of economic thought have been laid open. On the other hand, it is only by tracing the history of particular economic doctrines that the real interrelation of economic life and thought is revealed, and the fullest interpretation of economic theories, past and present, afforded. This logical succession of methods, hastened perhaps by the enduring influence of the historical school and of Roscher pre-eminently, explains the recent livelier study of economic "*Dogmengeschichte*,"—exemplified in the writings of Berens, Leser, Pierstorff, Gross, Mataja, Zuckerkandl, Ricca-Salerno, Böhm-Bawerk, Bloch, Cannan, Seligman, Taussig and a series of others.

The monograph before us, a history of theories of crises, represents a substantial contribution to this growing body of economic literature. The author's prefatory statement, that the interpretation of economic crises forms so central a point in the writings of many economists as